

January 8, 2013

Ms. Lisa D. Mares
For the City of Southlake
Taylor Olson Adkins Salla Elam, L.L.P.
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2013-00459

Dear Ms. Mares:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 475683.

The City of Southlake (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified report. You state the city will redact certain driver's license numbers pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code, social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code, and fingerprints pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009). You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample

The Texas legislature has amended section 552.130 to allow a governmental body to redact the information described in subsections 552.130(a)(1) and (a)(3) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. See Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). See id. § 552.130(d), (e). Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. See id. § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including fingerprints under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

of information.² We have also considered comments received from the requestor. See Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, you inform us some of the requested information was the subject of a previous request for information, in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2008-01417 (2008). In Open Records Letter No. 2008-01417, we determined that, with the exception of basic information that must be released, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. We have no indication that the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have changed. Accordingly, to the extent the information in the current request is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, we conclude the city may continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2008-01417 as a previous determination and withhold the information at issue in accordance with that ruling. See Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure). To the extent the submitted information is not subject to Open Records Letter No. 2008-01417, we will address your arguments against disclosure.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate the information constitutes or documents a communication. Id. at 7. Second, the communication must have been made "for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services" to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch., 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a confidential communication, id., meaning it was "not intended to be disclosed to third

²We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. See Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication." *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the intent of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. Osborne v. Johnson, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. See Huie v. DeShazo, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

You inform us Exhibit D consists of communications between or among an attorney for the city and city employees in their capacities as client representatives that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of legal services to the city. You state these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the city may withhold Exhibit D under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.³

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that concluded in a result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. Gov't Code §552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. See id. § 552.301(e)(1)(A). You state Exhibits C and C-1 pertain to a case that concluded in a result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. Based on your representation, we conclude section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code is applicable to Exhibits C and C-1.

However, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov't Code § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle Publishing Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold Exhibits C and C-1 under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.⁴

³As our ruling for this information is dispositive, we need not address our remaining arguments against its disclosure.

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

In summary, to the extent the information in the current request is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, the city may continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2008-01417 as a previous determination and withhold the information at issue in accordance with that ruling. The city may withhold Exhibit D under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. With the exception of basic information, the city may withhold Exhibits C and C-1 under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey W. Giles

Assistant Attorney General Open Records Division

fong W. Do.

JWG/dls

Ref: ID# 475683

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor

(w/o enclosures)